

# ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Did Active Promotion Planning Raise Average Grades?

DD/A Registry

79-3494

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater  
Director of Personnel

EXTENSION

NO.

Pers 79-6440

AT 5 E 58

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

DD/A REGISTRY

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1.

Executive Officer, DD/A

2.

3.

Acting Deputy Director  
for Administration

4.

5.

Deputy Director of Central  
Intelligence

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

This is for your information only. Thought it may be of interest as to the impact of uniform promotions.

Harry E. Fitzwater

Att

## Distribution:

Orig - DDCI

1 - ER

1 - DDA 1 - C/HRAS/OP

1 - D/Pers Chrono

1 - HEF Chrono

D/Pers/HEFitzwater:rj

(7 Nov 79)

SECRET

PERS 79-6440

31 October 1979

PLANNING MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

25X1 FROM :   
Chief, Human Resources Analysis Staff

25X1 SUBJECT : Did Active Promotion Planning Raise Average Grades? ☐

1. With the advent of active promotion planning, there has been at least a possibility that aggressive planning would close the gap between employee average and position average grade. During FY 1979, this has not been a problem for the Agency in aggregate. For three of the five career services, the average grade of employees has actually declined and for the same three, the gap between average grade of employees and the higher average grade of positions has actually increased. ☐

25X1

2. The following compilation illustrates the changes in average grade: (number in parens is the position average grade):

<u>Career Service</u>	<u>30/9/78</u>	<u>30/9/79</u>
D (DDO)	10.6286 (10.7697)	10.6233 (10.8720)
E (DCI)	11.2876 (11.3947)	11.1345 (11.5470)
I (NFAC)	10.8946 (11.1172)	10.8584 (11.1379)
M (DDA)	9.8202 (10.0919)	9.9308 (10.1299)
R (DDS&T)	10.5109 (10.7184)	10.5269 (10.7082)

As may be seen from these numbers, the employee average grade actually declined in the D, E, and I Career Services. ☐

25X1

3. From the above table, data with respect to the gap between employee average grade and position average grade can be displayed. The following compilation shows how the gap has enlarged (that is, position average grade has increased more than employee average grade) in the D, E, and I Career Services: ☐

25X1

<u>Career Service</u>	<u>30/9/78</u>	<u>30/9/79</u>
D (DDO)	.1411	.2487
E (DCI)	.1071	.4125
I (NFAC)	.2226	.2795
M (DDA)	.2717	.1991
R (DDS&T)	.2075	.1813

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

4. The above data have been drawn from the Career Service Grade Authorization (CSGA) tabulations prepared by Office of Personnel. ☐

25X1

5. Before any conclusions or projections can be based on the above outlined data, it must be noted that FY-79 was affected by some unique factors. The DDO position reduction which was implemented in February 1979 accounts for a significant portion of the increase of that career service's position average grade. During the same general time frame there was an unusually high rate of employee separation at grades above the DDO average. The slotting of Career Trainees against the DDO further reduced employee average grade. The DDO reduction had an impact on the "I" and "E" career services since those directorates utilized some of the position ceiling freed by the DDO cuts at a higher average position grade level. Increased hiring of entry level professionals in DCI and NFAC lowered the employee average grade in those Career Services. Since a large number of positions in DDO and NFAC are currently pending grade review by PMCD, the CSGA headroom picture could change significantly. ☐

25X1

6. One more factor which will have a direct impact on promotion headroom in FY-80 will be the implementation of the Senior Intelligence Service. The Comptroller has been instructed by OMB to lower the Agency average grade of positions from 10.67 to 10.51 in FY-80. Until the conversion of supergrade positions is complete, the Agency will technically exceed its average grade ceiling. It will be necessary to update the CSGA data after the supergrade positions and personnel are removed from the CSGA and the net impact can be assessed. ☐

25X1

7. In summary, it would appear that an aggressive promotion system did not have undesired impact on average grade during FY 1979, but it would be prudent to monitor carefully the promotion activity during FY-80 to ensure some promotion headroom survives the expected changes. (PMCD has participated in the preparation of this memorandum). ☐

25X1



25X1

SECRET